United Nations A/C.5/52/SR.58

General Assembly
Fifty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
8 May 1998

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the first part* of the 58th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 26 March 1998, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Chowdhury ..... (Bangladesh)
later: Ms. Daes (Vice-Chairman) ..... (Greece)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Mselle

Contents

Agenda item 17: Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*)

(e) Appointment of members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal (*continued*)

Agenda item 113: Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors (*continued*)

Agenda item 114: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 153: Human resources management (*continued*)

Agenda item 157: United Nations reform: measures and proposals (*continued*)

Agenda item 116: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1998-1999 (*continued*)

Office accommodation at the Palais Wilson (*continued*)

United Nations International Partnership Trust Fund (*continued*)

Agenda item 136: Financing of the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (*continued*)

Agenda item 141: Financing of the United Nations Support Mission in Haiti (*continued*)

* The summary record of the second part of the meeting appears as document A/C.5/52/SR.58/Add.1.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

98-80395 (E)

Agenda item 142: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Agenda item 153: Human resources management (*continued*)

Agenda item 159: Financing of the United Nations Observer Mission in Angola (*continued*)

Organization of work

Agenda item 119: Pattern of conferences (*continued*)

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

Agenda item 17: Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*)

(e) Appointment of members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal (*continued*) (A/52/105/Add.1; A/C.5/52/9/Add.1)

1. **The Chairman** drew the Committee's attention to the note by the Secretary-General contained in document A/52/105/Add.1, notifying the General Assembly of the death of Mr. Francis Spain of Ireland, a member of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, and to the note by the Secretary-General contained in document A/C.5/52/9/Add.1 informing the General Assembly that the Government of Ireland had nominated Mr. Kevin Haugh to fill the vacancy.

2. He would take it that the Committee wished to recommend by acclamation the appointment of Mr. Kevin Haugh to serve the remainder of the term of office of Mr. Francis Spain, namely until 31 December 1998.

3. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 113: Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors (*continued*) (A/C.5/52/L.28)

Draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.28

4. **Mr. Blukis** (Latvia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Chairman, said that the word "reports" should be substituted for "report" in the first line of the first preambular paragraph. In addition, the word "its" in the second line of paragraph 2 should be replaced by "the Secretary-General's".

5. *Draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.28, as orally amended, was adopted.*

Agenda item 114: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*) (A/52/488)

Agenda item 153: Human resources management (*continued*)

Agenda item 157: United Nations reform: measures and proposals (*continued*)

6. **The Chairman** proposed that the Committee, in view of the time constraints it faced, should defer its consideration of the question of its working methods to the second part of the resumed session. In the meantime, he would welcome comments and suggestions from members of the Committee, which would be reflected in the revised paper on the question.

7. *It was so decided.*

8. **The Chairman** drew the Committee's attention to the proposed United Nations Code of Conduct and proposed that it should recommend to the General Assembly that, having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the proposed United Nations Code of Conduct (A/52/488), and taking into account the views expressed by Member States, it should:

(a) Invite the International Civil Service Commission to examine the proposed Code of Conduct, as a matter of priority, at its forthcoming session;

(b) Request the Fifth Committee, in the light of the comments and observations of the International Civil Service Commission, to revert to the question of the proposed United Nations Code of Conduct during the resumed fifty-second session, with a view to taking a decision on it.

9. **Ms. Powles** (New Zealand) said that, while her delegation did not believe that it was appropriate to refer the draft Code to the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), since the Code was not intended for system-wide application, it would respect the wishes of those delegations that felt otherwise. The Committee should, however, seek a commitment from ICSC that its review would be completed in time for the second part of the resumed session in May, when she hoped that the Committee would be able to take a decision on the matter.

10. **Mr. Sulaiman** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation agreed with the proposal that the Code should be referred to the International Civil Service Commission, as had been its wish from the outset. The Advisory Committee should consider the Code since an administrative opinion was also needed and the Advisory Committee was the competent body.

11. **Mr. Bond** (United States of America) said that his delegation did not believe that referral of the proposed Code to ICSC was warranted or necessary, especially in view of the General Assembly's request that the matter should be expedited. He hoped that ICSC would give the matter prompt attention and thus enable the Committee to take a decision at the next part of the resumed session.

12. **Mr. Sulaiman** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the Chairman had been hasty in proposing a decision on the matter. His delegation would have liked to defer a decision to the following day in order to give Member States an

opportunity to consider the question of referring the Code to the Advisory Committee, which would contribute to the adoption of a more informed decision. He therefore proposed that the matter should be deferred to the following day.

13. **Mr. Armitage** (Australia), supported by **Mr. Yussuf** (United Republic of Tanzania), said that his delegation had joined in the consensus to refer the proposed Code to ICSC, could not agree to refer it to yet another body, namely, the Advisory Committee.

14. **The Chairman** noted that there was general agreement on the importance of the Code and appealed to members to support the draft decision he had proposed orally.

15. *The draft decision was adopted.*

Agenda item 116: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1998-1999 *(continued)* (A/C.5/52/L.23/Rev.1)

Office accommodation at the Palais Wilson (continued)

Draft decision A/C.5/52/L.23/Rev.1

16. **The Chairman** proposed that paragraph (f) of the draft text should be amended to read as follows:

> "Decides that a cost-benefit analysis of the use of existing conference facilities available at the Palais des Nations in Geneva shall be submitted to the General Assembly at its next resumed fifty-second session".

17. *Draft decision A/C.5/52/L.23/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

18. **Ms. Silot Bravo** (Cuba) expressed regret at the Committee's inability to specify which entity should carry out the cost-benefit analysis of the proposed move. That inability to adopt specific policy decisions damaged the credibility of the Committee, which was after all the guardian of the Organization's resources.

19. **Mr. Ekorong A Ndong** (Cameroon) said that, even though his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft decision, it regretted the vague nature of the text, which did not reflect the spirit that should inspire the Committee's decisions. He noted an apparent reluctance on the part of the Committee to refer specifically to the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) and the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) and wondered why those two oversight bodies were becoming taboo in the Committee.

20. **The Chairman** said that he too shared the concerns just expressed by the representative of Cameroon. Indeed, it was a matter of concern not only for the Committee but for the Organization as a whole.

United Nations International Partnership Trust Fund (continued) (A/52/7/Add.9)

21. **The Chairman** drew the Committee's attention to the question of the United Nations International Partnership Trust Fund and proposed that it should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the United Nations International Partnership Trust Fund (A/52/7/Add.9) and request the Secretary-General, taking into account the comments made in the Committee (A/C.5/52/SR.56), to report to the General Assembly, on a regular basis, on the activities of the Trust Fund and other related matters.

22. **Mr. Atiyanto**, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that more time was needed for the consideration of the item and he therefore wished to request that its consideration should be deferred to the second part of the resumed session.

23. **Mr. Blukis** (Latvia) noted that there was really little difference between the proposal of the Chairman and that of the Chairman of the Group of 77 and China, since the draft decision would provide for what amounted to a deferral of the item.

24. *The draft decision was adopted.*

Agenda item 136: Financing of the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan *(continued)* (A/C.5/52/L.25)

Draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.25

25. **Mr. Moktefi** (Algeria), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.25 on UNMOT, explained that it had been suggested in informal consultations that $15 million gross should be appropriated to the Special Account for UNMOT, in addition to the $8,275,700 already appropriated by the General Assembly.

26. *Draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.25 was adopted.*

Agenda item 141: Financing of the United Nations Support Mission in Haiti *(continued)* (A/52/798 and A/52/818)

27. **The Chairman** drew the Committee's attention to the report of the Advisory Committee (A/52/818). He took it that the Committee wished to take note of that report.

28. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 142: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*) (A/C.5/52/L.27)

Draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.27

29. **The Chairman** noted that the wording of the draft resolution, on Slovakia's contributions for the financing of peacekeeping operations, followed the precedent established in the case of the Czech Republic. He took it that the Committee wished to adopt it by consensus.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.27 was adopted.*

31. **Mr. Humenny** (Ukraine), speaking in explanation of position, said that the financial mechanism set forth in the draft resolution, while imperfect – it was not financially neutral for some Member States, including Ukraine – was a step in the right direction. Ukraine's own relocation from group B to group C for the apportionment of peacekeeping expenses had taken far too long.

32. **Mr. Thorne** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, and the associate countries of Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovakia, expressed satisfaction that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus. The European Union, however, still considered that the peacekeeping scale of assessments was in need of comprehensive revision.

33. **Mr. Bond** (United States of America) also expressed satisfaction at the successful resolution of the case of Slovakia. However, his delegation agreed with the European Union that the peacekeeping scale should be revised and simplified, the better to reflect the fundamental principle of capacity to pay. Some States wealthy enough to move to a higher group had not volunteered to do so.

34. **Mr. Varso** (Slovakia) said that his delegation associated itself with the remarks made by the representative of the United Kingdom. He welcomed the Committee's adoption of the resolution, which resolved the long-standing issue of his country's proper place in the scale of assessments for peacekeeping operations. The principle of capacity to pay had been fully taken into account.

35. **Ms. Letrot Hadj Hamou** (France) said that Ukraine's request for reclassification from group B to group C had been considered taking into account the fact that Greece had volunteered to move from group C to group B; the General Assembly had adopted resolution 50/224, which had established an ad hoc arrangement in that regard. Ukraine had been in group C ever since.

36. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, recalled that the main guidelines and principles governing the scale of assessments had been established by the General Assembly. It was imperative to continue to differentiate in apportioning expenditure between the regular budget and the peacekeeping budget. The financing of peacekeeping operations should reflect the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council. Furthermore, developed countries were presumably better able to pay than developing countries.

37. **Mr. Herrera** (Mexico) said that the current arrangement reflected the responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council, with their global interests. In view of their greater capacity to pay, they should not seek to evade those responsibilities.

38. **Mr. Zhang Wanhai** (China) said that the situation of Slovakia was a special case on which it was appropriate for the Fifth Committee to decide. Concerning Ukraine, the General Assembly had already taken measures to reclassify it, and consequently it was in group C. His delegation agreed with the remarks made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

39. **Mr. Thorne** (United Kingdom), speaking only on behalf of his own country, expressed agreement with the statement made by the representative of France.

40. **The Chairman**, recalling General Assembly resolutions 52/217 and 52/218, which had apportioned amounts totalling $52,485,450 gross for the international tribunals for Rwanda and the Former Yugoslavia in accordance with the scale of assessments applicable to peacekeeping operations for the year 1998, said that he took it that the Committee agreed that the provisions of draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.27 should be applied *pari passu* to the related assessments for the international tribunals in 1998.

41. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 153: Human resources management *(continued)*

42. **The Chairman**, in connection with the report of OIOS on the audit of the use of consultants (A/52/814), proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should decide to consider the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the audit of the use of consultants (A/52/814), in the context of its consideration of the comprehensive report of the Secretary-General on the engagement and use of consultants, as requested by the General Assembly in paragraph 4 of section VI of its

resolution 51/226 under the agenda item entitled "Human resources management", at its fifty-third session.

43. *It was so decided.*

44. **The Chairman**, in connection with the Secretary-General's report on privileges and immunities (A/C.5/52/2), proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should "decide to defer consideration of the report of the Secretary-General on behalf of and with the approval of the members of the Administrative Committee on Coordination on respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related organizations to its fifty-third session."

45. *It was so decided.*

46. **Ms. Silot Bravo** (Cuba) noted that the decision just adopted had already been taken informally during the main part of the fifty-second session, but had inadvertently been omitted from the report. The oversight was regrettable and reflected adversely on the working methods of the Committee.

Agenda item 159: Financing of the United Nations Observer Mission in Angola (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.29

47. **Mr. Smyth** (Ireland), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.29, drew attention to paragraph 11, which apportioned additional funds for the United Nations Observer Mission in Angola, and to paragraphs 8 and 9.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.5/52/L.29 was adopted.*

Organization of work

49. **The Chairman** said that he had a number of outstanding items to report on, including procurement, the Integrated Management Information System (IMIS) project, the tribunal for Rwanda, and Western Sahara, as well as the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) and the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), which had been discussed in informal consultations and would be laid before the Committee for formal decisions the following day. In the meantime, the coordinators for each of the first four issues would brief the Committee.

50. **Mr. Armitage** (Australia), the coordinator on procurement, said that good progress had been made in informal consultations on the draft text on procurement reform and outsourcing. Twenty-five operative paragraphs had been adopted. A cluster of related paragraphs concerning preferential treatment for certain groups of countries was still outstanding, as were the Secretary-General's request for reclassification of the Director of the Procurement Division and the issue of outsourcing practices. The Chairman of the Group of 77 and China was committed to a resolution, and only a little more time was required for completion of the informal consultations.

51. **Mr. Riva** (Argentina), coordinator of the informal consultations on IMIS, said that progress had been made at the two informal meetings which had been held, but at least one more meeting was needed to negotiate a consensus on the draft resolution.

52. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group of 77 and China fully supported the statement by the representative of Australia on procurement reform and outsourcing practices. On IMIS, the issues had become very complex, and the Committee should try to reach agreement in an informal meeting.

53. **Mr. Hanson** (Canada), coordinator of the informal consultations on the tribunal for Rwanda, said that two short meetings had been held, but it had not been possible to begin consideration of a draft decision or draft resolution. He recommended that the item should be taken up at the next part of the resumed session.

54. **The Chairman** said that he took it that the Committee wished to defer consideration of item 137 to the next resumed session.

55. *It was so decided.*

56. **Mr. Hanson-Hall** (Ghana), coordinator on financing of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO), said that no consensus had been reached on the provisional draft resolution under discussion in informal consultations. One particular paragraph remained a stumbling block. It had, however, emerged that there was agreement on financing MINURSO.

57. **Mr. Zahid** (Morocco) said that at the time of the introduction of the report on the financing of MINURSO (A/52/730 and Add.2), his delegation had refrained from commenting on certain aspects which it believed had nothing to do with financing, in the hope of accelerating the approval of a draft resolution on the subject. Nearly all draft resolutions on peacekeeping operations were adopted without any difficulty. The Advisory Committee had reported that consultations were under way between the United Nations and the Government of Morocco on the establishment of two new identification centres, bringing the number of identification centres to 11 instead of 9; the

delegation of Algeria had taken the position that it could not agree to that.

58. The Secretary-General had decided (S/1998/35, para. 30) that identification sessions initially scheduled to take place in Tan Tan and Goulemine for applicants resident in northern Morocco should be held at two northern locations, El Kelaa des Sraghna and Sidi Kacem. It was clear that that was a decision which had already been taken by the Secretary-General, and that Algeria had never been asked to approve the establishment of the two new centres.

59. The purpose of the provisional draft resolution on the financing of MINURSO was simply to allocate the financial resources needed to ensure the implementation of the settlement plan, which had been approved by the Security Council. As everyone knew, the impasse in the implementation of the plan resulted from the refusal of the other party to participate in the identification exercise. The reports of the Secretary-General of September and November 1997 (S/1997/742 and S/1997/882) had drawn attention to that situation. It was only after the signing of the Houston agreements that it had been possible to resume the identification process. Since then, progress had been made, as reported in documents S/1998/35 and S/1998/142. The identification centres were essential to the identification process, and, after consultations with Morocco and the other party, the United Nations had decided to open 12 centres, of which 9 would operate concurrently (S/1997/882, para. 61). According to information from the Secretariat and the Advisory Committee, of the 12 centres, only 11 were open. It was impossible to understand Algeria's objection to paragraph 7 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/52/816), which merely reproduced information which had been communicated by the Secretariat, and confirmed in informal consultations. It was impossible to take the position that the identification process should be completed as soon as possible, but refuse to agree to the establishment of new centres which had already been authorized, or to refuse to endorse the Advisory Committee's observations.

60. His delegation appealed to the delegation of Algeria, which had pledged full support for the settlement plan and the Houston agreements, to show flexibility, so as to provide to MINURSO the necessary resources to implement its mandate.

61. **The Chairman** said that he had sought guidance on how to make progress, not on the substance of agenda items.

62. **Mr. Mesdoua** (Algeria) said that the representative of Morocco excelled in the art of questioning facts. It was indicated in paragraph 4 of the report of the Secretary-General (S/1998/35) that nine centres would operate concurrently. According to paragraph 7 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/52/816), discussions were under way to open two additional centres in northern Morocco; when asked for explanations, the Secretariat had said that there were no identification centres in northern Morocco, only two operational annexes, and there would not be more than nine centres. The Secretary-General had decided to establish centres, on the proposal of the Special Representative, after consultation with the parties concerned. The texts were very clear. The Advisory Committee was an advisory body which made recommendations to Member States. So far, his delegation had shown complete flexibility, and had responded favourably to the proposal made in informal consultations by the representative of Portugal, supported by the representative of the United States of America, that paragraph 5 should be deleted from the provisional draft resolution. The question of Western Sahara had been considered at the political level in the Security Council and the Fourth Committee, and the Fifth Committee was responsible only for its administrative and budgetary aspects. He appealed to the representative of Morocco to respond favourably to the coordinator's appeal so as to enable MINURSO to complete its work.

63. **Mr. Zahid** (Morocco) said that ever since 1975, Morocco had shown incomparable flexibility. The Secretary-General had said in the report cited by the representative of Algeria that he had decided to establish two centres in northern Morocco; the report had been approved and endorsed by the Security Council. Morocco could not accept the idea that the draft resolution on MINURSO was different from other draft resolutions on peacekeeping operations. The representative of Portugal had informally proposed the deletion of a paragraph, which was what Algeria wanted, but it was not acceptable to his delegation.

64. **Mr. Mesdoua** (Algeria) said that there could be no question of pirating a draft resolution which belonged to the entire Committee.

65. **The Chairman**, making use of his prerogative as Chairman of the Committee, decided to terminate the discussion of item 125 at the current meeting. He requested the coordinator of the informal consultations on the item to continue his efforts to reach an agreement.

Agenda item 119: Pattern of conferences (*continued*) (A/C.5/52/L.26)

Draft decision A/C.5/52/L.26 (continued)

66. **Ms. Shearouse** (United States of America) said that the United States believed that, as a secular organization, the United Nations should respect the views and religions of all

its Member States, in keeping with the spirit of the Charter. Her delegation therefore wished to propose the following amended draft decision on the question of the implementation of paragraphs 5 and 6 of General Assembly resolution 52/214 A:

> "The General Assembly, reiterating its resolution 52/214 of 22 December 1997, decides that the United Nations official holidays shall be maintained at nine days, and requests the Secretary-General to take into account, *inter alia*, the local customs and practices of the United Nations Headquarters and other duty stations when determining the calendar of officially observed holidays."

67. **Mr. Thorne** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that it might be useful to hear the comments of the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management, since the Union believed that it was for the Secretary-General to take the decision on the question of the official holidays.

68. **Ms. Salim** (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management) said that the Secretary-General considered that he was already in full compliance with the provisions of resolution 52/214 A and she was therefore not in a position to communicate any additional information to the Committee.

69. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group could not accept the proposal made by the representative of the United States, since it contravened the spirit and letter of draft decision A/C.5/52/L.26. He appealed to the Committee to support that draft decision, which should be adopted by consensus.

70. **Mr. Al-Khalifa** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the countries members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and his own delegation, supported the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. He drew attention to the fact that *Journal of the United Nations* No. 1998/58 had not indicated that the Fifth Committee would consider agenda item 119 at the current meeting. Further, there had been no information regarding the current meeting on the meetings board. He hoped that those lapses were not part of a scheme to delay consideration of the draft decision. It was high time for the Committee to take a decision on the draft.

71. **The Chairman** said that he regretted that the meeting had not been announced on the meetings board. The agenda item had not been indicated in the *Journal* because, when the *Journal* was being prepared, the Committee had not yet decided whether or not the item would be discussed at the current meeting. The representative of Indonesia had proposed that the Committee should adopt draft decision A/C.5/52/L.26 by consensus, and he wondered whether delegations were prepared to do so.

72. **Ms. Shearouse** (United States of America) said that her delegation had proposed an amendment to the draft decision, and she insisted that the Committee should take a decision on that amendment.

73. *Ms. Daes (Greece), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

74. **Mr. Rahmtalla** (Sudan) said that his delegation had not been convinced by the Chairman's explanation of why the agenda item had not been listed in the *Journal*. His delegation supported the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. What the United States delegation was proposing was not an amendment to the draft decision but a new draft decision.

75. **Mr. Sial** (Pakistan) said that he supported the statements made by the representatives of Indonesia and Qatar. His delegation shared other delegations' concern that the agenda item had not been announced in the *Journal*. The representative of the United States of America could not request the Committee to take a decision on its proposal, since the United States had introduced an entirely new draft decision. In that regard, the Committee should abide by the provisions of rule 91 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

76. **Ms. Shearouse** (United States of America) proposed that consideration of the item should be deferred to a meeting of the Committee to be held on the following day in order to enable delegations to study the United States amendment.

77. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, since the Group had introduced the draft decision on the previous day, the 24-hour requirement had been met. The Committee could therefore take a decision at the current meeting.

78. **Mr. Al-Khalifa** (Qatar) supported the statement made by the representative of Indonesia.

79. **Mr. Rahmtalla** (Sudan) said that the Committee had already begun taking decisions on a number of drafts, and there was no reason not to take action on draft decision A/C.5/52/L.26.

80. **Mr. Zahid** (Morocco) said that the proposal made by the United States delegation was a radical departure from the draft decision. His delegation supported the statement made by Qatar on behalf of the countries members of the

Organization of the Islamic Conference, and it hoped that the Committee could adopt the text submitted by the Group of 77 and China, while allowing delegations to make statements of position.

81. **The Chairman** said that the members of the Committee should be flexible and endeavour to adopt the draft decision by consensus. In order to avoid putting the draft decision to a vote, she suggested that consultations should be continued until the next day with a view to reaching a consensus.

82. **Mr. Al-Khalifa** (Qatar) said that there was no need to postpone consideration of the draft decision when the majority of the members of the Committee were in favour of voting on the draft at the current meeting.

83. **Mr. Lozinski** (Russian Federation) supported the Chairman's suggestion to continue consultations on the draft decision and take action on the draft on the following day.

84. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, supported the statement made by the representative of Qatar. There was no reason to defer consideration of the item.

85. **Mr. Herrera** (Mexico) said that his delegation supported the Chairman's suggestion to defer consideration of the item, and hoped that a consensus would be reached on the draft.

86. **Mr. Thorne** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that efforts should be made to avoid putting the draft decision to a vote. Consultations should therefore be continued with a view to reaching a consensus.

87. **Mr. Hanson** (Canada) said that his delegation supported the Chairman's suggestion to defer consideration of the draft decision, since it was extremely important to reach a consensus on the draft.

88. **Mr. Watanabe** (Japan) said that his delegation associated itself with the other delegations that had supported the Chairman's suggestion. The Committee should make an effort to reach a consensus on the matter.

89. **Mr. Zahid** (Morocco) said that the Group of 77 and China had not requested a vote on the draft decision. It had only requested that the Committee take action on the draft at the current meeting.

90. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group attached the utmost importance to the adoption of the draft decision by consensus, and it requested the Committee to proceed to take action on the draft.

91. **Mr. Jaremczuk** (Poland) said that his delegation supported all the delegations that were in favour of deferring action on the draft decision.

92. **The Chairman** said that, while she took note of the statements made by the delegations of Qatar, Indonesia and Morocco, those delegations should demonstrate flexibility and agree to a deferment of action on the draft decision until the following day.

93. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that delegations had had ample time to consider the draft decision. The Committee – and the United States delegation in particular – should endeavour to be flexible and to understand the position of the Group of 77 and China.

94. **Mr. Al-Khalifa** (Qatar) supported the statement made by the representative of Indonesia. There was no reason to postpone action on the draft decision.

95. **The Chairman** said that the Committee had before it three proposals: to take action on draft decision A/C.5/52/L.26; to take action on the amendment proposed by the United States of America; and to defer consideration of action on the draft to the following day. She read out rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which dealt with the adjournment of debate on an item.

96. **Mr. Zahid** (Morocco) supported the statement made by the representative of Indonesia. His delegation was not certain whether the rule which the Chairman had invoked was applicable to the debate on the draft decision, especially since the representative of the United States of America was proposing a new draft decision, not an amendment. There was no need to defer action on the draft, and all delegations should demonstrate greater flexibility.

97. **Mr. Rahmtalla** (Sudan) supported the statement made by the representative of Morocco.

The first part of the meeting ended at 6.10 p.m.